DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 404 CS 503 405

AUTHOR Hocking, John E.
TITLE Intra-Audience Effects at Sporting Events.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (Austin, TX, April 7-10, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Athletics: *Audiences: Behavioral Science Research: *Communication Research: *Group Behavior: *Group Dynamics: Interaction: Research Needs: Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Audience Analysis: *Audience Response: *Crowd Behavior: Spectator Sports

ABSTRACT

The phenomenon of crowd behavior at sports events is examined in this paper. Previous treatments of why spectators enjoy watching sports events are examined, showing that these studies have largely ignored the potential role of intraaudience influence processes. A brief literature review notes the role of feedback between the communication event and the audience. The next section of the paper introduces four theoretical perspectives that postulate different social influence processes on crowd behavior: (1) contagion theory, which emphasizes the transformation of normal individuals into members of a "collective mind": (2) convergence theory, which argues that a self-selection process results in a group of similar individuals being in the same crowd and subsequently feeling and behaving similarly: (3) emergent norm theory, which predicts that individuals in a crowd act in particular ways because they believe that a particular behavior is appropriate or required: and (4) informational theory, which postulates that crowd members seek additional information from each other to judge the accuracy or reality of the events they view. An example of behavior at a college basketball game illustrates how some of these theoretical perspectives can be applied. The final section of the paper suggests directions and variables in research on crowd behavior at sports events. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203404

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTRA-AUDIENCE EFFECTS AT SPORTING EVENTS

John E. Hocking
Department of Speech Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John E. Hocking
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Southern Speech Communication Association Convention, Austin, Texas - April, 1981

CS503405

INTRA-AUDIENCE EFFECTS AT SPORTING EVENTS

It is a major hassle to attend a University of Georgia football game. The stadium and surrounding "free" viewing areas allow crowds of over 65,000, which is nearly 50% larger than the size of the city of Athens itself. The traffic and parking situations are atrocious--unbelievably bad. Getting to and from, and in and out of the stadium is an ordeal which turns a 2½-hour football game into an all-day event. I might add parenthetically that the arrival of Herschel Walker in Athens has added not only to the desirability of attending the games, but to the difficulty.

The Georgia-South Carolina game last fall was particularly touted for its importance. Georgia, of course, was undefeated, while South Carolina had lost just once--to Southern Cal, in Los Angeles--and had just come off a win over Michigan in Ann Arbor. The fact that South Carolina had the front runner and eventual winner of the Heisman Trophy, George Rodgers, added to the game's appeal and no doubt contributed to the decision of ABC sports to televise the game nationally. Those of us in Athens thus had the rare choice of attending the game in person or watching on television.

I do not believe that any sport lends itself to television quite as well as football. The many camera angles provide a variety of shots that allow the viewer to see all aspects of

the game from a better vantage point than even the best seats in the stadium allow. And the instant replays are fantastic. Football is a game with a few intense seconds of action, followed by 30 or so seconds of waiting. The contribution of the instant replays to the viewer's enjoyment of football is as great or greater than their contribution to any other televised sport.

They do not sell beer at the football stadium in Athens. And the hotdogs are cold. And the seats are hard benches, and the faculty seats are around the zero yard line. In short, there are many reasons for sitting home in one's living room and watching the game, such as eating hot hotdogs, drinking cold beer, seeing a much better view of the game--not once, but repeatedly with the replays, and avoiding the hassle of driving to the stadium, fighting the traffic, finding a place to park, and so on. Clearly, rational human beings would watch the game on TV instead of going to the stadium.

I am forced to report that I attended the Georgia-South Carolina game last fall in person. And further, not only did I go, but the organizer of this panel, Dave Clavier, went too, and his tickets were not only on the zero yard line, but they were on row three. You cannot see <u>anything</u> from row three. Why did Dave and I go to the game when we could have watched it on television? Williams (1977) makes a distinction between the "<u>game event</u>, defined as the action taking place on the field plus directly related activities taking place on the

sidelines, and the stadium event, defined as the total sequence of activities occurring in the stadium, both perceived and participated in by the fans and including the game event" (p. 135). It is a major thesis of this paper that an extremely important component of the "stadium event" is crowd behavior and that the reactions that spectators have on other spectators is a major factor contributing to the excitement, the arousal, and ultimately the entertainment value that results from sports spectatorship. In short, it is my contention that we went to the game largely because of intra-audience effects.

Just What Kind of "Effects" Are We Talking About Anyway?

Obviously the dependent variable in the anecdote used to introduce this paper was attendance at a live sporting event vs. watching the event on television. This effect was probably mediated by the participants' perceptions of the relative degree of enjoyment to be accrued by attending in person vs. watching on TV. Similarly, physiological arousal is viewed by many theorists, particularly Schacter (1962) as an important component in the experience of such an emotion as enjoyment.

Another important component of the evaluation of the enjoyment of attendance is the audience members' perceptions of the intrinsic quality of the contest itself (Zillman, Bryant and Sapolsky, 1979). The Georgia-South Carolina game was a tightly

fought exciting game of high quality. I believe that although I could have made that judgement from my living room in Athens, I made a more extreme judgement of the same kind because of the stadium crowd's response to the game. Similarly, when Herschel Walker went off tackle, cut to the outside, and ran by the entire South Carolina team 70 plus yards for a touchdown, I could judge the play itself and Herschel's ability as a running back from observations made on television. But the reality of the situation was that when he broke clear and quickly (oh, so very quickly) scored, I was part of 65,000 people who displayed very overt and extreme symptoms of arousal/excitement/enjoyment. The crowd's reaction, in other words, affected my evaluation of the quality of the game in general, and this play in particular.

Another, less sublime, example may illustrate the point more clearly. Dominick Wilkens is the Herschel Walker of the University of Georgia Basketball program. Dominick is a spectacular player--the closest thing to Dr. J currently playing in college. If Dominick made a semi-spectacular dunk and I were watching on TV (and let's assume that the announcers did not make a particularly big deal of the play), I might rate it a 6 on an 11-point scale. On the other hand, if I were in the arena and saw the dunk, and if the crowd not only cheered wildly during the immediate post-dunk period but continued to cheer for a full minute after the play, my opinion of the quality of that particular play, as well as my opinion of Dominick would likely increase.

If you gave me the same questionnaire, I might even mark an 8 or 9. And after I filled out your questionnaire I might even stand up and shout and stomp a little myself. I do not believe that I would do this at home, nor would I do this if the game were being played in an empty arena, or if the crowd response to the play had been more moderate.

These, then, are the kinds of intra-audience effects, or in more research-oriented terms, dependent variables, I have in mind: audience affective reactions--e.g., arousal, excitement, enjoyment, and perceptions of the "game event" and its various components. Previous treatments addressing the general issue of why spectators enjoy watching sports events have largely ignored the potential role of intra-audience influence processes (for example see the review by Zillman et al, 1979).[1]

A Brief Literature Review

Audience Response Research

The most common perspective from which audience response has been viewed by Speech Communication researchers has been to conceive of it as feedback to a Communication source. The typical research design has manipulated the type (e.g., positive or negative) or the amount of feedback, while measuring its impact on source behaviors such as fluency (Stoltz and Tannenbaum, 1963), speaking rate (Davis, 1967), eye contact (Amato and Ostermeier, 1967), speech content change (Karns, 1969), or frequency of

opinion statements (Verplanck, 1955). Studies such as these clearly demonstrate that audience response can have important and observable effects on communication sources. Positive feedback tends to increase speaker self-confidence, fluency, etc., while negative feedback has the opposite sort of effects.

Applying this research perspective to a sporting event would simply require the game itself to become the message source. We would then expect positive feedback to increase the competence of the performers while negative feedback would have deliterious effects on performance. Such audience response is widely believed to account for the apparent advantage enjoyed by sports teams competing in their home arena. Schwartz and Barsky (1977) provide evidence which confirms a homefield advantage in organized sport. They examined home and away win-loss records of teams in four major sports and found the advantage to be most pronounced in the indoor sports of basketball and hockey, and least pronounced in the outdoor sports of baseball and football. The authors conclude from their data, as well as from observations of the relationship between audience size and performance and outcomes, that the home advantage is "almost totally independent of visitor fatigue or lack of familiarity with the home playing area; it is mainly attributable to the social support of the home audience" (p. 641).

Thus, whether the stimulus is a communication source engaging in a one-to-many speaking event, or a sporting event of

some kind, audience response--feedback--can have import effects on the stimulus.

Intra-audience Effects Research

Far less attention has been paid to any intra-audience effects resulting from the feedback process. When audience members generate observable and/or audible responses to a stimulus, these responses are also to a greater or lesser extent perceivable by other audience members. Speculative theorizing and anecdotal evidence of intra-crowd influence processes has existed since the 19th century (Milgram and Toch, 1969). Most of this writing was motivated by concern with anti-social behavior of crowds. Richard LaPiere's book, "Collective Behavior," published in 1938, more directly addresses the crowd situation which characterizes the audience at most sports gatherings. To my knowledge, LaPiere is the first writer to explicitly address the possibility of intra-audience effects in situations in which the audience is collectively and benevolently gathered to observe a stimulus (whether it be a play, a speech, or whatever). LaPiere goes so far as to describe the use of confederates in theatre audiences as a means of influencing others in the crowd. "By scattering throughout the audience men who know when overt expression is desirable for the leader, untimely applause can be checked and vigorous approval assured. A quick but pointed hiss may prevent untimely clapping from spreading; a burst of applause at the right moment may be picked up and spread until it rings from the rafters" (p. 224).

It is only within the last ten years or so that researchers have begun to systematically investigate the effects of feedback on other audience members. Hylton (1971) was the first to empirically document LaPiere's speculations. Using confederates in large audiences of about 75 persons each, he manipulated observable audience responses. Naive subjects were exposed to either positive or negative feedback responses which were emitted by their fellow audience members. Hylton's predictions, that subjects exposed to positive audience response would be more favorable toward the speech topic and the speaker than those exposed to negative audience feedback, were supported. Other related studies have demonstrated similar results in other one-to-many speaking situations (Hocking, 1972), in triads (Margreiter, Hocking and Hylton, 1974), and with speech topic experts generating the audience response (Baptiste, 1969).

Sports events which draw large crowds are distinctly different from the communication situations in which the above research was conducted. In particular, the degree of excitement and physiological arousal among both participants and spectators which characterize major athletic confrontations are examples of variables which differentiate the athletic event from the typical one-to-many speaking situation. Hocking, Margreiter, and Hylton (1977) conducted an experiment in a situation which more nearly approximated the overt crowd response potential present at many athletic events. Their research was conducted in a rock and roll bar.[2] Sixty male and female college undergraduates were required

as part of a "bogus" class assignment to go to a bar on one of two nights and "observe communication behavior in the field." A group of about 30 confederates attended both nights, one night giving positive responses to the band playing in the bar and the other night giving negative responses. Subjects filled out a questionnaire in their classes on the day following participation. The band was aware that the experiment was being conducted and agreed to play the same songs in the same order on both nights, and to attempt to hold their delivery style constant. The results showed that those subjects exposed to positive responses of other audience members evaluated the band more positively, stayed longer at the bar, and had a greater desire to see the band again than did subjects who were exposed to negative audience reactions.

To my knowledge, however, there has been no empirical study examining intra-audience effects at sporting events. While empirical research examining audience responses to communication stimuli is relatively new, interest in "collective" or crowd behavior, as noted above, is shown in the literature as early as the 19th century. Although most of this writing is speculative and anecdotal in nature, and motivated by a concern with crowd (mob) anti-social behavior, it is suggestive of theoretical perspectives within which intra-audience effects at sporting events might be usefully examined.

Theoretical Perspectives

The key problem of collective behavior theory is to explain changes which occur in individual conduct in crowd situations. Three theoretical perspectives, each of which postulate different social influence processes, appear to dominate writings which attempt to explain behavior changes which occur in crowds: contagion theory; convergence theory; and emergent norm theory (Toch and Milgram, 1969; Mann, 1979).

Contagion theory is generally attributed to Gustave La Bon (1895; cited in Toch and Milgram, 1969). La Bon argued that members of crowds undergo radical transformations which can change them from rational human beings into savage, irrational, uncontrollable members of a "collective mind"--in short, a mob. Like an infectious disease (La Bon was a physician), contagion is emotion or overt behavior which is spread from one crowd member to others. Allport (1924) extended the contagion idea by suggesting that it is a circular reaction: one crowd member stimulates others who then react overtly--this reaction, in turn, further stimulates the first individual and so on. This model of intra-crowd influence is not unlike typical source-receiver interaction models common to our discipline, except of course, it is a receiver-receiver mutual reciprocal influence process. A similar model was proposed by Hylton (1971) in his original intra-audience effects paper. La Bon argues that as contagion infects a crowd, individuals within it begin to uncritically accept all suggestions presented to them. This, along with the feeling of anonymity,

contributes to a Jekyl-Hyde like transformation which can result in irrational, uncontrollable and violent crowd behavior.

As Milgram and Toch (1969) point out, although contagion theory in general and La Bon's writing in particular have come in for heavy doses of contemporary criticism, his work remains highly interesting and potentially relevant for understanding the effects of intra-crowd effects. La Bon's theory, for example, is similar in some ways to Zimbardo's (1969) "deindividuation theory" which suggests that variables such as anonymity, arousal, and dress similarity contribute to a person's feeling that he is part of the masses rather than an individual, which in turn, can lead to uninhibited and anti-social behavior.

In contrast to contagion theory which emphasizes the transformation of normal individuals into members of a "collective mind," or mob, convergence theory argues that a self selection process results in a group of similar individuals being in the same crowd and subsequently feeling and behaving similarly. Clearly, convergence theory is a highly useful perspective for considering audience behavior at sporting events. Individuals who are predisposed to respond favorably to Herschel Walker's touchdown run against South Carolina are much more likely to be at the game. From this perspective, persons possessing a similar behavioral disposition are brought together because each wishes his or her presence in the crowd to serve as an excuse for manifesting overtly the behaviors in which he or she would like to

engage. Social Facilitation Theory (Zajonc, 1965) fits well within a convergence theory framework since it argues that many response tendencies (e.g., laughter or applause) will occur more readily (i.e., will be facilitated) by the presence of other individuals.[3]

Emergent norm theory evolves from the work of Sherif (1936), Asch (1956) and others in their work on social influence in small groups. Normative social influence occurs when an individual modifies a response to conform to their perceptions of the expectations of others in order to receive a positive outcome. Norm theory would thus predict that an individual acts in a crowd in particular ways because he or she believes that the behavior is appropriate or required. That virtually all individuals, even non-Americans and leftist-pinko college professors, stand during the playing of the national anthem is probably a good example of behavior which is well explained by norm theory.

A final theoretical perspective which may be of use in understanding intra-audience effects might be termed an "informational" theory.[4] Informational social influence occurs when an individual simply accepts information from others as accurate evidence about the nature of reality. Hocking et al (1977) argue that much of the intra-audience effects observed in their rock and roll experiment were a result of this type of influence. To the extent that a communication stimulus is ambiguous--for example, a basketball official's call against the home team--the crowd needs additional

information to form a judgement. For most of the crowd, the correctness of such calls are almost always ambiguous. However, if members of the crowd react extremely negatively, particularly those who were sitting in an area of the arena near the area on the court where the relevant play occurred, others in the audience may use this audience response as information on which to base their own judgements about the correctness of the call. Similarly, crowd response could easily contribute to an individual's post-game evaluation of the game itself. If the crowd response was intense and positive it is more likely that the individual will believe that it was indeed a better game than they would have had the response been less intense and/or less positive. In other words, the audience response would provide additional information to the individual audience members which could contribute to their judgements of officials' calls, plays by the athletes, and overall judgements of the contest itself.

These theoretical perspectives--contagion, convergence, emergent norm, and information--are by no means mutually exclusive. Some of them are more useful in explaining and predicting some kinds of audience effects, while others better explain other sorts of effect. At times, all of them could operate simultaneously; at others, they could be more usefully conceived as occurring sequentially.

To illustrate this, let's take as an example a recent basketball game between Georgia and L.S.U. (a game that, coincidentally, was also televised). The game was played in Athens so

obviously mainly Georgia fans attended. And since the game was televised probably a few "marginal" fans (remember fan is short for fanatic) probably stayed home. Nonetheless, convergence theory would account for about 11,000 people with strong behavioral dispositions of a particular kind being in attendance.

The game is closely fought and there is extremely overt, intense, loud audience reaction to virtually every play. People respond extremely positively to everything good that happens for Georgia, and, to a lesser extent, negatively when good things happen for L.S.U. Most everyone in attendance seems to be becoming more and more excited/aroused as the game builds to a climatic ending. In short, it's a barn-burner. Contagion theory would seem to best account for much of this arousal.

Suddenly, at a crucial point near the end of the game, an official calls a foul on a Georgia player who had appeared to make a clean block of an L.S.U. player's shot. The crowd sitting near that part of the court immediately jumps to their feet and gives overt and obvious negative reaction, indicating that they believe that the call was a bad one. This is all the information that many other people need, even those sitting high in the arena who could not possibly have clearly seen the play. Their colleagues at courtside have sent them a loud and clear message (i.e., information) that the official missed the call--badly. The booing starts and spreads quickly (contagion). A few fans start to throw objects on the floor--then more do the same--then even more

(contagion). But Hocking does not. He is content to merely boo and shout obscenities. Is this because he is immune to such base emotions as those which would contribute to the object-throwing behavior? Is he a good man rooting well? Hell no! I am as mad as everyone else. But remember, anonymity (or at least the illusion of anonymity) is a key variable for contagion theory to be useful. I am a non-anonymous (assistant professor) sitting in the middle of the faculty section. The extant norms I perceive to be operative and which suggest to me what behaviors are appropriate and expected clearly inhibit any object throwing by me. So emergent norm theory probably better explains the effect that I throweth not. Norm theory, however, could also explain the behavior of some of the object throwers. Perhaps as a few individuals started to throw things, even non-anonymous members (obviously, those with tenure) felt that new norms of appropriate behaviors had emerged.

As this example illustrates, some of the theoretical perspectives would generate the same predictions, while others would make different predictions. And all of them of course would interact with, and/or would mediate, and/or would be mediated by, the "game event." The sorting out of which perspective works best in explaining which types of intra-audience effects is the obvious direction that empirical work in the area should take. It is to this topic which we will now turn.

Research Directions

The fact of the matter is that we really do not know very much more about intra-audience effects at sporting events now than we did when La Bon wrote his speculative pieces in 1895 or when LaPiere wrote "Collective Behavior" in 1938. The purpose of this final section of the paper is to suggest some potentially important variables which may singly or interactively contribute to intra-audience effects, and to outline some research directions that might be fruitfully pursued by Communication researchers interested in the effects of crowd behavior at sports events.

As discussed earlier the dependent variables which are conceived in this paper as constituting "effects" are: enjoyment; arousal/excitement; and evaluation of quality of play, including the officiating.

Research at Live Sports Events

An important research project would be one which provided empirical support for the major thesis of this paper; that audience response at sporting events affects other audience members' arousal/excitement/enjoyment, attendance, and evaluations of the event itself. It may seem patently obvious that such is the case, but my view is that it is important to have a firm foundation of empirical support for even many apparently obvious phenomena, lest we forget that the world is not really flat.

A non-systematic sampling of variables which would be likely candidates for contributing to the degree of intra-audience effects experienced by audience members are listed below. Some of these variables may operate alone, or interactively with some of the others on the list.[5]

1. Crowd size - other beings being equal, a large crowd would be expected to produce greater effects than a smaller one.
2. Crowd density - a tightly packed crowd would generally contribute to larger effects than a less dense crowd.
3. Response intensity/volume - we would expect that extreme response would produce greater effects than less intense responses.
4. Indoor vs. outdoor arenas - Indoor arenas seem to create the illusion, and perhaps consequently the reality, of more intense responses, and consequently contribute to greater audience effects than do outdoor arenas.
5. Arena/stadium design - both the football stadium and the basketball arena at the University of Georgia seem to inhibit intra-audience effects. The spectators are simply too far from the area of play to allow several of the other variables such as crowd density to operate. The football stadium is open at both ends which, I believe, allows much of the audience

response to escape out the ends before it has a chance to affect other audience members (one end is currently being closed in, expanding capacity to about 80,000). The basketball arena is a barn-like building more suited for rodeos. In fact, when basketball coach Hugh Durham was hired at Georgia, part of the deal he received was a guarantee that seats would be added closer to the floor.

Knowledge of intra-audience effects could greatly contribute to the quality of sports facility design. That is, arenas probably should be designed to maximize intra-audience effects if intra-audience indeed do increase crowd enjoyment/excitement/arousal/etc.

6. Standing/sitting - while most American sporting events are observed from chairs, this is not always the case. Particularly in Europe, standing is common. Mann (1979) argues that this fact contributes to violence at many British sporting events.
7. Anonymity - several of the theoretical perspectives suggest that an individual who feels anonymous will feel less inhibited about generating extreme response of all kinds than the individual who has not been similarly "deindividuated."

8. Crowd make-up and predisposition - the faculty and students sit in adjoining sections at the University of Georgia basketball games. While the students are going crazy, the faculty tends to sit there passively during the games. As noted in the earlier example, emergent norm theory probably best accounts for the differences in these responses. Frankly, I would rather sit with the students.

Mediated Sports Spectating; i.e., watching on television

As noted earlier, Williams (1977) distinguishes between the "game event" and the "stadium event." Television does a great job of covering the game event, particularly in football and basketball. They do a poor job of covering the "stadium event," of which, as I have argued, audience response is the most important part. A recent content analysis of camera shots used in television coverage of football games found that shots of the crowd represented only three percent of all shots (Williams, 1977).

There would seem to be a variety of techniques that could be used which could increase the viewers' enjoyment/excitement/arousal of watching sports events on TV by placing greater emphasis on crowd reaction. Announcer comments describing crowd response to the game event are rare. However, a recent and interesting study by Comisky, Bryant and Zillman (1977) demonstrated the important role that sports broadcasting commentary can play in influen-

cing viewers' perception of the event. These authors found that the commentators' descriptions of the action taking place at an ice hockey game had dramatic influence on viewer perceptions of the extent to which the game was "action packed." A similar study could be conducted in which the commentary describing the live crowd response to the action could be manipulated. For example, what effect would it have on viewers if instead of being told by the hockey game announcers, "look at that body check; I think LaMondiere isn't going to take much more of this. What a game!"--they were given this information, but were additionally told, "the crowd is going crazy; these people are tearing this place apart; the noise is unbelievable; I hope you can hear me because I can't hear myself!"?

Pro-basketball suffers from rating problems so severe that the CBS affiliates in some markets refuse to broadcast the games. It may not be coincidence that typical pro games seem to be played before sparse and/or nonresponsive crowds. In contrast, college games typically are televised in a manner which shows extremely responsive audiences packed around the court. Of course, ratings for pro games go up at play-off time. The most obvious explanation for this is that the games are between the top teams and are simply more important. However, the crowds at playoff games are also both larger and more responsive. It would certainly be possible to experimentally test the effects on home viewers of the increases in the live crowd responses versus other variables which could account for the ratings increases.

The general point is that audience response at the sporting event itself could be used by the media to increase the effect of the broadcast on the home viewer. Research addressing such a possibility would be of value.

Finally, do intra-audience effects occur when individuals watch televised sporting events in the presence of other individuals? Only one study has examined the enjoyment of a televised event under different social circumstances and it did not directly address the audience response issue. Sapolsky and Zillmann (1978) had subjects view a basketball game played at the 1976 olympics between Yugoslavia and the United States and simultaneously rate their degree of "pleasure" or "displeasure" when a basket was scored by each team. They then examined these ratings in relation to the number of people present as the game was being watched. No social facilitation effects were found. That is, the number of people was unrelated to rating of pleasure or displeasure. However, no information is given about the audience members' overt reactions to the various scoring plays, and further, since the game was so one-sided in terms of outcome, viewers, even in the largest viewer groups studied (five and over) may not have reacted much when either team scored. If the game has been closely contested and if U.S. baskets were responded to with cheering, applause, etc., it seems highly probable that this response would have affected the other audience members. Studying intra-audience effects of home viewers of sporting events would be a fruitful research direction.

Footnotes

[1]Obviously there are many other effects that audience response can have on audience members. In particular, a variety of anti-social audience response behaviors, ranging from heckling to bottle-throwing to outright rioting, have attracted the interest of social scientists. Soccer hooliganism, for example, has been of particular interest to British social psychologists. In this paper, however, I am going to generally de-emphasize these anti-social kinds of intra-audience effects. The reader interested in these sorts of sports spectator outcomes is referred to the excellent chapter, "Aggression and Sport," by Gaskell and Pearton (1979), as well as Footnote 2 below.

[2]Ironically, and sadly, major athlete events and rock concerts share the potential for another type of crowd behavior which apparently accounted for the deaths of 11 rock and roll concert goers attempting to attend a performance of the group, "The Who" in Cincinatti, Ohio, in 1979. As Mann (1977) writes, an entry panic can occur when access to a stadium is too narrow to enable rapid entry. "A crush builds up and those at the head near the entrances are trampled" (p. 348). Mann (1977) lists numerous examples of tragic outcomes resulting from "disintegration of the queue principle," including the case of an Egyptian soccer game in which 49 people were killed.

[3]Sapolsky and Zillmann (1978) attempted to examine potential Social Facilitation effects among televised sports viewers and found no support for the social facilitation hypothesis. However, as will be discussed in the "research directions" section of this paper, their experiment was, at best, a weak test of social facilitation theory in a sports viewing context.

[4]See Deutsch and Gerard (1955) for a discussion of "normative" vs. "informational" social influence.

[5]Some of these variables are also discussed by Milgram and Toch (1969) and/or Mann (1979).

References

Allport, F. H., Social Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

Amato, P. P. & Ostermeier, T. H., "The effect of audience feedback on the beginning public speaker." The Speech Teacher, 1967, 16, 56-60.

Asch, S. E., "Studies of independence and conformity: A minority of one against a unanimous majority." Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70, 1-70.

Baptiste, L. "The effects of observable authoritative response on attitude change." Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Speech Communication, San Jose State College, 1969.

Comisky, P., Bryant, J., and Zillmann, D., "Commentary as a substitute for action." Journal of Communication, 1977, 27, 150-159.

Davis, J., "Variations in verbal behavior in dyads as a function of varied reinforcing conditions." Speech Monographs, 1967, 34, 443-447.

Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. G., "A study of normative and informational social influence upon individual judgment." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 629-636.

Gaskell, G. & Pearton, R., "Aggression and Sport." In J. H. Goldstein (ed.), Sports, Games and Play: Social and Psychological Viewpoints, Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1979.

Hocking, J., "The effects of sequentually varied observable audience response." Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Speech Communication, California State University, San Jose, 1972.

Hocking, J. E., Margreiter, D., and Hylton, C., "Intra-audience effects: A field test." Human Communication Research, 1977, 3, 243-249.

Hylton, C., "Intra-audience effects: Observable audience response." Journal of Communication, 1971, 21, 253-265.

[illegible]ns, C., "Speaker behavior to nonverbal aversive stimuli from the audience." Speech Monographs, 1969, 36, 126-130.

La Bon, G., Psychologie des foules. Translation: The Crowd, London: Unwin, 1903.

LaPiere, R. T., Collective Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Mann, L., "Sports crowds viewed from the perspective of collective behavior." In J. H. Goldstein (ed.), Sports, Games and Play: Social and Psychology Viewpoints, Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1979.

Margreiter, D. G., Hocking, J. E., and Hylton, C., "An exploratory study of intra-audience effects in small interpersonal settings." Paper presented at the annual convention of the Central States Speech Association, Milwaukee, April 1974.

Milgram, S., and Toch, H., "Collective Behavior: Crowds and social movements." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd ed.)(Vol. 4), Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Sapolsky, B. S. and Zillmann, D., "Enjoyment of a televised sports content under different social conditions of viewing." Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1978, 46, 29-30.

Schacter, S., and Singer, J. E., "Cognitive, social, and psychological determinants of emotional states." Psychological Review, 1962, 69, 379-399.

Schwartz, B. and Barsky, S. F., "The home advantage." Social Forces, 1977, 55, 641-661.

Sherif, M., The Psychology of Social Norms. New York: Harper, 1936.

Stolz, W., and Tannenbaum, P., "Effects of feedback on oral encoding behavior." Language and Speech, 1963, 6, 218-228.

Verplanck, W., "The control of the content of conversation: Reinforcement of statements of opinion." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 668-676.

Williams, B. R., "The structure of televised football." Journal of Communication, 1977, 27, 133-139.

Zajonc, R. B., "Social facilitation." Science, 1965, 149, 269-274.

Zillmann, D., Sapolsky, B., and Bryant, J., "The enjoyment of watching sports contests." In J. H. Goldstein (ed.), Sports, Games and Play: Social and Psychological Viewpoints, Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1979.

Zimbardo, P. G., "The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse and chaos." In W. Arnold and D. Levine (eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 17), Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.